Name of Applicant: Lafayette School Corporation

Overall Ranking: 91.5 out of 100

I. PROJECT ABSTR	RACT	(Up to 5 POINTS)		
0 points	1-2 point range	3-4 point range	5 points	
Abstract not provided or	Only includes 1-2	Includes 3-4 required elements	Includes all 5 required	
does not address any	required elements (i.e.,	(i.e., student needs; participants	elements (i.e., student needs;	
required elements (i.e.,	student needs; participants	to be served; activities;	participants to be served;	
student needs;	to be served; activities;	outcomes; or key personnel).	activities; outcomes; or key	
participants to be served;	outcomes; or key	Points reduced if exceeds two	personnel). Points reduced if	
activities; outcomes; or	personnel)	pages.	exceeds two pages.	
key personnel)	•			

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **3.6**

Comments: Points deducted as the applicant did not include an explicit description within the Abstract as to how this existing program would be expanded through new program funding.

II. COMPETI	TIVE PRIORITY POINTS		(Up to 10 POINTS)		
A. Required Descriptions (Up to 2 Points)					
0 points Descriptions not provided	Just one of the two required descriptions provided (how application priority is met, OR origin of partnership)		2 points Both descriptions provided (how priority is met, and origin of partnership)		
Averaged Peer	Reviewer Score = 2				
Comments:					
B. Organizat	ional Priority Points (Up to 4 Points)				
4	0 points Does not meet criteria	4 points Applicant meets criteria			
Comments:	r Reviewer Score = 4				
C. Programn	ning Priority Points (Up to 4 Points)				
0 points Does not meet criteria		4 points Meets criteria & area listed in Section V Goals & Object			
Averaged Peer	Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4				
Comments:					

Section II Total (averaged) Points out of 10 Possible: 10

III. NEED	FOR PROJECT		(Up to 5 POINTS)			
A. Data E	A. Data Evidence Demonstrating Need (Up to 3 Points)					
0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points			
	Data not provided for all	All three areas addressed (i.e.,	Achievement, demographic & behavioral data			
Data	three areas (i.e.,	achievement, demographics &	shown for EACH school (Attachment B) and			
evidence not	achievement, demographics	behavioral) and presented for	demonstrates high need in both poverty			
presented	and behavioral)	EACH school to be served	levels and academic achievement.			
Averaged I	Peer Reviewer Score = 1					
Comments	Comments:					
Demograph	Demographic, mobility and some limited achievement data (2013-14) were provided but not the required					
behavioral	data.					

B. Demonstrate Expanded Out-of-School Time Programming (Up to 1 Point)

0 points: Chart/graphic not provided 1 po		nart/graphic provided showing increased time that addresses gaps for each school			
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1					
Comments:					
C. Describe Process for Assessing Need	s/Services	(Up to 1 Point)			
0 points: Process and/or partner involvement not described 1 point: Process and partners involved are clearly described					
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1					
Comments:					

Section III Total (averaged) Points out of 5 Possible: 3

IV. PARTNERSHIPS/C	OLLABORA	TIONS		(Up to 5 POINTS)		
A. Describe Collaboration with Other Agencies/Funding Streams (Up to 1 point)						
0 points: Not addressed or too award point	0 points:Not addressed or too vague to award point1 point:Applicant demonstrates collaboration with other agencies, e.g.,Title I, Child Nutrition, TANF, State/local programs					
Averaged Peer Reviewer S	Score = 1					
Comments:						
B. Describe How Each	Partner's Co	ntribution Su	ipports Program (Up to 1	point)		
0 points: Attachment F not s	ubmitted	1 point	: Applicant completed and sub	mitted Attachment F		
Averaged Peer Reviewer S	Score = 1					
Comments:						
C. Memorandum of Un	derstanding	for Applican	t & Key Partners (Up to 3	Points)		
0 points	1 p	oint	2 points	3 points		
MOU/s detailing partner roles		OU provided in	MOU/s provided in Appendix	MOU/s provided in Appendix		
& responsibilities not provided.		t does not fully	for <u>all key partners</u> offering	for <u>all key partners</u> providing		
NOTE: This is in addition to		te roles &	basic info relevant to	clearly-articulated expectations		
Attachment F.	Attachment F. responsibilities between applicant/partner roles for applicant and for partner					
applicant & partner						
Averaged Peer Reviewer	Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.3					
Comments: Basic information responsibilities needed.	ation addresse	ed in MOUs, p	provided for all key partners	s. More detail regarding		

Section IV Total (averaged) Points out of 5 Possible: 4.3

V. PROGRAM DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

(Up to 30 points)

A. Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, Activities and Assessments (Up to 8 points)

0-2 point range

Table overviewing Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, Activities & Assessments includes *less than* all three of the required goals, i.e., (1) student achievement, (2) behavioral, & (3) family involvement

3-6 point range

Includes all three required goals, i.e., achievement, behavioral and family involvement -- as well as HS, pre-K, or summer goals, *if applicable*.

At least two objectives provided per goal.
Activities are aligned with each objective;
performance measures include numerical
targets and are each connected to a specific
measurement strategy

7-8 point range

Includes all three required goals, i.e., achievement, behavioral and family involvement -as well as HS, pre-K, or summer goals, if applicable.

At least two objectives provided per goal. Highly engaging activities are aligned with objectives; challenging performance measures include numerical targets and are each connected to a specific measurement strategy

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **8**

Comments:

B. Evidence of Previous Success (Up to 2 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
	If previous grantee : Some description of	If previous grantee: Clearly documented quantitative
Information	previous attendance rates and program	evidence of past 30+ and 60+ attendance rates and academic
not provided	benefits.	outcomes (e.g., ISTEP+, DIBELS, NWEA) showing
in	If new grantee : Limited information on	increased performance.
APPENDIX.	, , , , ,	If new grantee : Specific activities provided to support student
	strategies for providing academic assistance.	recruitment and attendance and to provide academic assistance.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2

Comments:

C. Design Requirements (Up to 20 total points for Items 1-8)

C-1. Requirements of GEPA 427 (Up to 1 point)

0 points
Information not provided in the APPENDIX or within
proposal parrative.

1 point
Specific equitability issue identified and addressed (either in Appendix or proposal narrative) to reduce program barrier

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1

Comments:

C-2. Targeted Students and Their Families (Up to 3 points)

1 point
Only partial information provided
(i.e., only Attachment B List of
Schools submitted; OR only narrative
supporting criteria & process to
recruit students provided). If List of
Schools (Attachment B) not
submitted zero points

2 point

Identifies Title 1 and non-Title 1 schools (Attachment B); and describes (in narrative) general strategies for recruiting students. Justifies inclusion of any schools with less than 40% poverty (if applicable).

3 points

Submits Attachment B (identifying schools). Narrative describes specific strategies for recruiting students; and justifies inclusion of schools with less than 40% poverty (*if applicable*).

Majority of served schools demonstrate HIGH NEED (e.g., D/F schools; poverty rates greater than 50%)

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.6

Comments:

Attachment B submitted; greatly exceed 40% poverty threshold. General strategies for recruitment of students provided by applicant.

C-3. Dissemination of Information (Up to 2 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
	Outlines general steps the applicant	Provides specific steps to disseminate detailed program
Information not	will take to disseminate general	information including: service description, program
provided	program information.	location, and how to access the program.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2

Comments:

C-4. Communication with Schools (Up to 3 Points)

1 point Less than all four topics are addressed (nonpublic students; accessing academic records; sharing student progress; and alignment of in-school and out-of-school-time efforts). Zero points if none of 4 topics.		2 points All four topics are addre (nonpublic students; acce academic records; shar student progress; and alig of in-school and out-of-se time efforts)	essing its sample appropriate appropriate information and the sample appropriate appropria	3 points All four topics addressed; and applicant demonstrates its strong understanding and commitment to appropriately obtain & use student data to inform efforts (e.g., specifies strategies for sharing information with teachers & parents; detailed MOU included in Appendix if applicant is not an LEA).	
	eer Reviewer Score				
				ve been more explicitly expressed.	
C-5. Parent points)	tal Involvement, F	amily Literacy, and R	Related Family	y Educational Attainment (Up to 3	
0 points Information not provided	1 point Plan describes at leas one, solid activity to engage parents in the program.	needs/resources co	community onducted; <u>and</u> es planned to	3 points Evaluation of needs/resources conducted; and multiple activities specified to engage parents; and needs of working parents considered.	
	eer Reviewer Score	2 = 3			
Comments:					
C-6. USDA	Approved Snack	s/Meals for 21st CCL	C Participant	ts (Up to 2 points)	
Information no Applicant of (optional) sn program p		ow snacks/meals will be acquired & distributed to sites; OR specification that snacks/meals meet USDA and IDOE guidelines how snacks/meals will be acquired & distributed; and that snack meet USDA and IDOE guidelines		(i.e., Both required elements included: how snacks/meals will be acquired &	
	cei Keviewei Score	5 — 2			
Comments:	ly Cohodulo (II- 40	F ai4a)			
0 points	ly Schedule (Up to	5 points) 3 point range		4-5 point range	
General weekly schedule provided that meets Information not provided Applicant intends to also operate during summer OR extended-breaks, but did not submit separate weekly schedule.			ade meets min & MS school	weekly schedule provided for EACH site that imum hours of operation requirements; Elem edules reflect diverse and engaging activities mic, behavioral, enrichment/recreational); te schedules are provided for summer and extended breaks (if applicable).	
Averaged P	eer Reviewer Score	e = 4.6			
Comments:					
C-8. 21st C	CCLC Learning Co	enter Messaging (Up to	o 1 point)		
	0 points No description for meeting the requirement Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1			1 point cribes how it will meet the requirement	
Comments:					

Section V Total (averaged) Points out of 30 Possible: 28.8

0 points	1-2 points range	3-4 point range	5 points
	Includes one-dimensional	Includes detailed plan for	Needs of program staff assessed and PD is a
Information	description and plan for	providing PD; connects PD to	tiered-approach, addressing needs of
not provided	providing PD (e.g., focus	program quality and goals of	specific staff roles (i.e., leadership vs.
	is solely on staff	project; PD strategies center	instructional needs). Multiple approaches
	attendance at State and	around State/national workshops	will support needs (State & national
	national meetings or	and trainings, but also include	workshops/conferences; and ongoing
	conferences – but no PD	anticipated trainings (e.g., First	trainings to support locally-identified
	plan is articulated to	Aid, vendor-provided trainings	needs). Plan addresses initial kick-off, turn-
	support specific needs of	to support staff use of software	over and ongoing training for new and
	center's staff, aligned to	instructional programs). May	veteran staff; connects PD to program
	its program goals &	include a detailed chart of	quality and goals of the project; includes
	objectives)	planned PD activities.	detailed chart of planned PD activities.
Averaged F	Peer Reviewer Score = 4.6		

Comments: Missing required IDOE trainings.

VII. EVALUATION (Up to 15 POINTS)						
A. Identification of Local Evaluator (Up to 3 points)						
1 point Applicant intends to hire local Loca		2 points Local evaluator identified (external to the program) with evaluation experience			to Selected local evaluator with demonstrated expertise in data analyses, report writing, and afterschool program knowledge	
Averaged Peer Re	eviewer Sco	ore = 3	•	•		
Comments:						
B. Evaluation De	sign (Up t	o 10 points	s)			
O-2 point range Plan is not provided or of insufficient detail to convey understanding of local evaluation expectations Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 10 O-2 point range Some key elements are included in local evaluation design plan, but several descriptions are missing or vaguely presented O-2 point range Some key elements are included in local expectations – w elements better ar others. Applicant n Section V performa assessments to sco (or high			nderstandir th some ke ciculated th tust address nce measure in this rat	ey nan s all res &	9-10 point range Plan clearly articulated. Includes evaluator's roles; addresses collection/analyses of all Section V performance measures & assessments; details eval implementation timeframes; and specifies how findings are shared and used to improve program	
C. Annual Repor	rting (Up t	o 2 points)				
O points Information not provided. Applicant does not address its obligation to submit reports/data for both State and federal reporting Applicant adequately addresses at least one key annual reporting obligation, e.g., local program evaluator's report submitted to IDOE at end of each program year (showing program quality evidence, attendance trends and progress toward performance measures) Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2				stands its obligation to submit reports/data e., annual local program evaluator's report quality evidence, attendance trends and performance measures; and data required Grantee also uses IN-QPSA online self-		
Comments:						

VIII. SUPPORT FOR STRATEGIC PRIORITIES			(Up to 5 POINTS)	
0 points	1-2 points	3-4 points	5 points	
	Applicant affirms that	Applicant provides concrete examples	Strong evidence (multiple strategies)	
Information	its program will align	of how its program will align to Indiana	provided supporting extended-learning-	
not provided	with Indiana	Academic Standards (e.g., collaborative	time program's alignment with Indiana	
	Academic Standards	planning between regular classroom	Academic Standards via routine	
	but does not	teachers and extended-learning-time	coordination of planning, PD and academic	
	adequately convey	staff; evidenced-based software used for	efforts between program and school/district	
	how that will occur	literacy support)	staff where students attend	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5				
Comments:				

IX. SUSTA	INABILITY PLAN		(Up to 5 POINTS)
0 points	1 point	3 points	5 points
	Outlines existing	Outlines existing	Outlines existing partnerships, expanding partnerships
Information	partnerships and a	partnerships and potential	& potential partnerships; provides a well-conceived
not provided	general plan for	partnerships; and identifies	plan for sustaining program levels through increased
	sustaining program	potential future funding	local capacity and/or future funding sources.
	levels beyond the grant.	sources (e.g., general	Establishes sustainability goal for Year One
		funds/Title I)	programming.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4.3			
Comments: Some general descriptions needed specific examples.			

X. SAFETY AND TRANSPORTATION		(Up to 5 POINTS)		
0 points	1-2 point range	3-4 point range	5 points	
	Provides some general	Demonstrates detailed program safety	Demonstrates detailed program safety plan	
Information	staffing requirements	plan (background checks on	(background checks on file/confidential);	
not provided	(e.g., criminal	file/confidential); district/agency	district/agency staffing requirements met;	
	background checks)	staffing requirements met; required	required parent sign-in/out; MOU provided	
	and commits to	parent sign-in/out; MOU provided (if	(if facility not located in school); and safe	
	providing students'	facility not located in school); and	transportation provided to/from center and	
	transportation home	safe transportation provided to/from	home that meets needs of working families;	
	after program	center and home that meets needs of	and addresses use of IAN	
		working families	Safety Standards	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 4.3				
Comments: Needed explicit language that needs of working families were considered/and how.				

XI. BUDGET FORM/NARRATIVE, DETAILS & SUMMARY			(Up to 5 POINTS)
0 points	1-2 point range	3-4 point range	5 points
	Some budget narrative pieces	Budget narrative includes all	Exemplary budget narrative
Budget Form	completed, but not all. Examples:	anticipated line items (e.g., staffing,	clearly articulates all anticipated
(Budget	(a) key anticipated costs not	PD, evaluation, contracted services;	line items (e.g., staffing, PD,
Narrative) not	reflected in budget (e.g.,	transportation). Narratives	evaluation, contracted services;
completed by	evaluation and PD costs	adequately explain costs that are	transportation). Narratives
applicant.	missing); OR (b) budget includes	aligned to activities described in	summarize costs that are clearly-
	cost items not substantiated in	proposed RFP. Costs appear	aligned to activities in the
	proposal narratives; OR (c)	reasonable and permissible (and	proposed RFP. All costs appear
	excessive line items for	some items may require pre-approval	reasonable and permissible. No
	equipment costs (without solid	by IDOE). Budget Summary is	errors on Budget Summary; costs
	justification and intent to obtain	completed correctly and matches	match those in Budget
	IDOE pre-approval).	costs in Budget Form/Narrative.	Form/Narrative.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3.6			

Comments:

• FYI to IDOE: Year 1 Budget represents half a school year (since program begins January 2019).

Years 2-4 are full year programs.

- Not certain what the TOTAL request is (across entire grant period), due to some inconsistent figures used within the proposal: Cover Sheet vs. p12 Summary Budget Request vs. p12 Budget Worksheet Categories/Annual Totals.
- Costs requiring IDOE approval (equipment, field trips, other) appear reasonable and allowable and they are directly-aligned to proposed activities.

XII. GRANT PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION			(Up to 5 POINTS)	
Not organized in prescribed format. Program Narrative section far exceeded 30-page maximum (i.e., 35 or more pages)	1-2 point range Grant materials are provided, but not in the sequence requested. Abstract exceeds 2 pages/Program Narrative section exceeds 35 pages; Did not double-space/use 12-point font.	3-4 point range Grant materials provided in sequence requested. Abstract and Program Narratives do not exceed maximum (2 pages/35 pages). Proposal double-space/12-pt font; and pages numbered with identifying headers on each page.	5 points Exceptionally well organized with materials provided in sequence requested. Abstract and Program Narratives do not exceed maximum (2 pages/35 pages). Proposal double-space/12-pt font; and pages numbered with identifying headers on each page.	
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5				
Comments:				

2018–Cohort 9 RFP: 21st Century Community Learning Centers **Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, August 2018**

Name of Applicant: Lafayette School Corporation

Summary of Averaged Peer Reviewer Scores	Points Possible	Averaged Score of Peer Reviewers
I. Project Abstract	5	3.6
II. Competitive Priority Points	10	10
III. Need for Project	5	3
IV. Partnerships/Collaboration	5	4.3
V. Program Design and Implementation	30	28.8
VI. Professional Development Plan	5	4.6
VII. Evaluation Plan	15	15
VIII. Support for Strategic Priorities	5	5
IX. Sustainability Plan	5	4.3
X. Safety and Transportation	5	4.3
XI. Budget Narrative	5	3.6
XII. Proposal Organization	5	5
TOTAL POINTS	100 Total Points Possible	91.5